54

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,347	07/02/2001	John M. Baron	10004912-1	8254

22879	7590	02/28/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/897,347	BARON, JOHN M.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas E Shortledge	2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1-4, 7-12, 15-19, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Hamann (6,092,036).

As to claims 1, 9, and 17, Hamann teach:

creating a localization spreadsheet (building translation tables, col. 3, lines 51-

52);

storing identifiers associated with alphanumeric strings to be included in a textual

document (text ID's within the translation table, Fig. 2, elements 46);

storing alphanumeric string in a first natural language where each of said

alphanumeric string is associated with respective ones of said identifiers (a translation

table containing a source language text, target language text, and a corresponding ID,

Fig. 2, elements 42, 44, and 46);

storing alphanumeric string in a second natural language where each of said

alphanumeric string in said second natural language is associated with respective ones

of said identifiers (the translation table also includes an application text translation table

for each target language to be used on the system, the table having a text identifier for

each text string of the source or target languages, col. 4, lines 15-17, and 25-28);

creating the string table (application text translation tables) from said localization

spreadsheet (master translation table) including said identifiers and said alphanumeric

strings of one of first and second natural languages (each application text translation

table within the master translation table contains source language application text items

used within the application program and the corresponding target language application

text items, col. 4, lines 28-31).

Hamann does not explicitly teach a first, second and third column. However, it is

inherent that within a translation table, separate columns would be used to list the text

identifier and the corresponding text strings (the source language text and target

language text), thus, creating three columns respectively containing text identifiers and

their text strings.

As to claims 2 and 10, Hamann teaches generating a plurality of said string

tables wherein each string table includes said alphanumeric strings from the same

column of cells from said localization spreadsheet, (each application text translation

table within the master translation table contains source language application text items

used within the application program and the corresponding target language application

text items, col. 4, lines 28-31).

As to claims 3, 11, and 19, Hamann teaches:

reading said string table using a computer program (an application program is

able to obtain the translation information application text translation table, col. 33-37);

creating screens using said alphanumeric strings contained within said string

tables (the application program creates objects, menus, buttons, and other objects

having associated text, col. 4, lines 41-44); and,

displaying said screen to a user of said computer program (the created objects,

menus, buttons, and other objects having associated text are then used to form a

graphical user interface, (col. 4, lines 41-45) inherently displayed to the user).

As to claims 7, 15, and 22, Hamann teach storing in a fourth column of cells an

alphanumeric string in a third natural language associated with respective ones of said

identifiers (creating a language table, where the user is able to add new languages to

the table along with their corresponding information, (col. 6, lines 42-43). It would be

inherent a transition table containing numerous target languages, and having the ability

to add new target languages would have the language text in seperate columns).

As to claims 8 and 16, Hamann teach representing one of a menu, prompt and

information exchange by said alphanumeric string (creating translations for the objects

such as windows, menus, buttons, and other objects having associated text, col. 4, lines

41-44).

As to claim 18, Hamann teach using said string table within a main software

routine to include a foreign language in an interfacing software program (a multi-lingual

data processing system containing a translation tables, col. 4, lines 10-13).

As to claims 23, Hamann teach:

creating a localization spreadsheet (building translation tables, col. 3, lines 51-

52);

storing identifiers associated with alphanumeric strings to be included in a textual

document (text ID's within the translation table, Fig. 2, elements 46);

storing alphanumeric string in a first natural language where each of said

alphanumeric string is associated with respective ones of said identifiers (a translation

table containing a source language text, target language text, and a corresponding ID,

Fig. 2, elements 42, 44, and 46);

storing alphanumeric string in a second natural language where each of said

alphanumeric string in said second natural language is associated with respective ones

of said identifiers (the translation table also includes an application text translation table

for each target language to be used on the system, the table having a locality identifier

for each locality or target language into which it can be translated, col. 4, lines 15-17,

and 25-28);

creating a plurality of string tables from said localization spreadsheet including

said identifiers and said alphanumeric strings from one of said first and second natural

languages (each application text translation table within the master translation table

contains source language application text items used within the application program and

the corresponding target language application text items, col. 4, lines 28-31);

identifying a change in either said identifier column or in any of said language

columns, (recognizing when the user edits or adds a new language information, alerting

the user to input the locality information, col. 6, lines 42-46).

highlighting (alerting the user through a dialog box), in response to said

identifying step, entries in the other columns which are associated with identified

changes in a particular column ((a user is able to edit the or add a new locality and

when a new information is entered, a dialog box appears notifying the user to enter the

locality identifier, (col. 6, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to not only alert the user when a locality

identifier is needed, but to also alert the user to update the columns corresponding to

the columns that had been edited, so that they system was able to more efficiently

translate the software without modifying the source as taught by Hamann, col. 2, lines

9-11)

Hamann does not explicitly teach a first, second and third column. However, it is

inherent that within a translation table, separate columns would be used to list the text

identifier and the corresponding source and target text string. Listing these elements as

corresponding columns within a table, it would necessary for the table to contain three

columns.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 4-6, 12-14, and 20-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hamann as applied to claims 1, 9, and 17 above.

As to claims 4 and 12, Hamann teach highlighting (alerting the user through a

dialog box) one of said identifier in response to a change made to a corresponding ones

of said alphanumeric strings of one of said first and second natural languages (a user is

able to edit the or add a new locality and when a new information is entered, a dialog

box appears notifying the user to enter the locality identifier, (col. 6, lines 40-44). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

not only alert the user when a locality identifier is needed, but to also alert the user to

update the text identifier if either of the text entries was edited, so that they system was

able to more efficiently translate the software without modifying the source as taught by

Hamann, col. 2, lines 9-11)

As to claims 5, 13 and 20, Hamann teach highlighting ones of said alphanumeric

strings of one of said first and second natural language in response to a change made

to a corresponding one of said identifier (a user is able to edit the or add a new locality

and when a new information is entered, a dialog box appears notifying the user to enter

the locality identifier, (col. 6, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to not only alert the user when a locality

identifier is needed, but to also alert the user to update the text strings if either of the

text identifier was edited, so that they system was able to more efficiently translate the

software without modifying the source as taught by Hamann, col. 2, lines 9-11)

As to claims 6, 14, and 21, Hamann teach highlighting, in response to a change

made to one of said alphanumeric strings in said first natural language, a corresponding

one of said alphanumeric strings of a second natural language, (a user is able to edit

the or add a new locality and when a new information is entered, a dialog box appears

notifying the user to enter the locality identifier, (col. 6, lines 40-44). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to not only alert the

user when a locality identifier is needed, but to also alert the user to update a text string

if a corresponding text string was edited, so that they system was able to more

efficiently translate the software without modifying the source as taught by Hamann, col. 2, lines 9-11)

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jain (5,434,776), Murow et al. (5,664,206), Park et al. (6,064,951), White, III et al. (6,493,661), and Li et al. (6,205,418).

Jain teaches creating multi-lingual computer programs by dynamically loading messages.

Murow et al. teach localizing a computer program by using tables to organize and relate languages.

Park et al teach a query that is able to retrieve results from numerous multi-lingual websites.

White, III et al. teach using tables to create text strings and translate a program between languages.

Li et al. teach providing multi-language capability in a computer-based target application, by dynamically changing the language selections for the text-based information.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E Shortledge whose telephone number is (703)605-1199. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis Smits can be reached on (703)306-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TS
02/09/2005